

Housing Update

Affordable Housing & Foreclosures

Rick Nelson, Director

CountyStat Principles

- **Require Data Driven Performance**
- **Promote Strategic Governance**
- **Increase Government Transparency**
- **Foster a Culture of Accountability**



Agenda

- **Affordable Housing**
 - DHCA Performance Measures
 - Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community - County Indicators
- **Foreclosures**
 - Foreclosure Events – Montgomery County Compared to Other Maryland Counties
 - Foreclosure Hot Spots in Montgomery County
 - County Foreclosure Prevention Programs



Meeting Goals

- **Affordable Housing:**
 - Evaluate progress towards County affordable housing goals.
- **Foreclosures:**
 - Evaluate the current state of foreclosure events in the County, compare to previous quarters, and compare to other Maryland counties.



Affordable Housing: DHCA Headline Measures

Headline Measures

- 1. Total affordable housing units produced and preserved**
 - Number of affordable housing units produced and available for occupancy
 - Number of affordable housing units preserved and available for occupancy
 - Number of produced affordable housing units funded by the County
 - Number of preserved affordable housing units funded by the County
- 2. County cost per unit of affordable housing produced**
- 3. County cost per unit of affordable housing preserved**
4. Gains achieved in neighborhoods receiving Neighborhood Revitalization funding or services
5. Percent of cases that achieve voluntary compliance in Code Enforcement cases before a citation is written
6. Number of housing Code Enforcement repeat offenses (More than 2 cases in a 2-year period)
7. Percent of Landlord-Tenant cases mediated successfully (Cases not referred to the commission)
8. Average length of time required to conciliate landlord/tenant disputes that do not go to the Landlord-Tenant Commission

In this CountyStat meeting, only DHCA's affordable housing headline measures will be reviewed.



Affordable Housing Units Produced and Preserved: Key Definitions, Funding Sources & Programs

Funding Sources

- CDBG
- Community Legacy
- HOME
- HIF
- HIF Acquisition & Rehab Fund
- No Cost
- NSP-NCI
- Weatherization (DOE/State)

Programs

- Group Home
- MPDU
- Multifamily
- NSP-NCI
- Rental Agreements
- Rental-Closing Cost Assistance
- Single Family Rehab
- Single Family Foreclosure Programs
- Weatherization Programs


Term	Definition
Production	New construction or rehab of a market rate unit added to the inventory
Preservation	Acquisition and/or rehab of an existing unit with affordability restrictions
Pipeline unit	A unit is considered in the pipeline as soon as the County commits to a project. A unit remains in the pipeline until it is online; this is true even if the project does not draw funds in a given year.
Online unit	A unit is considered online once funds have been exhausted, acquisition/rehab/construction is complete, and the unit is ready for occupancy.
Projected unit	A unit that is expected to be funded with a future funding allocation.

Effective FY2010, affordable housing unit production and preservation includes the above funding sources and programs.



Affordable Housing Headline Measure:

Total affordable housing units produced and preserved



Affordable Housing Headline Measure:

Total affordable housing units produced and preserved

Production	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11		FY12	FY13	FY14
				To Date	Goal			
County-Funded Units Online	103	534	436	382	819	1,019	33	27
No-Cost Units Online	116	242	114	43	182	191	201	211
Production Pipeline	336	200	949	359	237	100	57	36
Total	555	976	1,499	784	1,238	1,310	291	274


Preservation	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11		FY12	FY13	FY14
				To Date	Goal			
County-Funded Units Online	34	423	254	209	543	432	87	61
No-Cost Units Online	131	0	700	404	737	774	813	871
Preservation Pipeline	954	190	300	243	170	365	211	134
Total	1,119	613	1,284	856	1,450	1,571	1,111	1,066



Affordable Housing Headline Measures:

County cost per unit of affordable housing produced

County cost per unit of affordable housing preserved



Affordable Housing Headline Measures:

County cost per unit of affordable housing produced


County cost per unit of affordable housing preserved

Measure	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11		FY12	FY13	FY14
				To Date	Goal			
Production	\$68,270	\$57,076	\$44,672	\$79,068	\$46,858	\$35,099	\$39,766	\$39,242
Preservation	\$57,932	\$43,827	\$36,820	\$36,502	\$35,425	\$35,531	\$43,063	\$46,408



Affordable Housing: FY08-FY10

Units and Cost Produced/Preserved



Since FY08, the County has increased the number of affordable units produced and preserved while reducing the cost per unit.



Affordable Housing: County Indicators

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community Indicators: Summary of Findings

- **Key indicators improved and/or remained the same compared to last year**
 - Percent of housing burdened renters has decreased relative to last year and is moving away from the national and regional trends
 - Percent of housing burdened owners continues to remain the same
 - Average days on market has improved compared to the same quarter last year
- **The home ownership rate is one area to monitor closely**
 - The home ownership rate has declined relative to last year (2008) and is decreasing relative to both the national and regional benchmark trends
- **Median rents is another area to watch**
 - Median rents have increased over time and remain above the median of benchmarked jurisdictions. While this indicator was approaching the regional median, it is now diverging from the regional trend, which is in decline.



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community Indicators: Summary of Findings

Regional & National	Montgomery County compared to:				
	Last year	Natl Median	Regional Median	Natl Trend	Regional Trend
Home ownership rate	Decreased	Below	At the median	Away from median	Away from median
Housing burden – Homeowners	Remained the same	Below	At the median	Remained the same	Remained the same
Housing burden – Renters	Decreased	Below	Below	Away from median	Away from median
Median value of owner occupied housing units	Decreased	Above	Above	Remained the same	Remained the same
Median gross rent	Increased	Above	Above	Remained the same	Away from median
Regional Only	Same quarter, last year	Regional Median		Regional Trend	
Average number of days on market for home sale	Decreased	Above the median		Remained the same	
Number of home sales per 100,000 population	Decreased	At the median		Remained the same	


Note: In general, a year to year change of +/- 1 unit is labeled “remained the same.” A +/-1 unit difference from the median is labeled “at the median.”

Indicators are sets of data that represent a high-level barometer of County performance and reflect the quality-of-life in Montgomery County that are benchmarked against other counties throughout the region and the nation. They are subject to external factors often beyond the control of County government.



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community

Indicator: Home ownership rate



In 2009, the median home ownership rate was 75%. Montgomery County had a home ownership rate of 69%. In 2009, the highest value was 83% (Washington Co, MN) and the lowest value was 50% (Arlington Co, VA).




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; 1-Year Estimates B25003 Tenure Occupied Housing Units Universe:

CountyStat

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community

Indicator: Home ownership rate



In 2009, the median home ownership rate was 70%. Montgomery County had a home ownership rate of 69%. In 2009, the highest value was 79% (Loudoun Co, VA) and the lowest value was 45% (District of Columbia).



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; 1-Year Estimates B25003 Tenure Occupied Housing Units


Housing Update

17

11/9/2010

Universe:


CountyStat

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Housing burden (Homeowners)**

In 2009, the median value was 39%. In Montgomery County, 37% of homeowners pay greater than 30% of their income for housing and are considered housing burdened. In 2009, the highest value was 53% (Suffolk Co, NY) and the lowest value was 23% (Johnson Co, KS).



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; 1-Year Estimates B25003
Tenure – Universe: Occupied Housing Units

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Housing burden (Homeowners)**


In 2009, the median value was 36%. In Montgomery County, 37% of homeowners pay greater than 30% of their income for housing and are considered housing burdened. In 2009, the highest value was 48% (Prince George's Co, MD) and the lowest value was 31% (Howard Co, MD).



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; 1-Year Estimates B25003
Tenure – Universe: Occupied Housing Units

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community

Indicator: Housing burden (Renters)




In 2009, the median value was 46%. In Montgomery County, 44% of renters pay greater than 30% of their income for housing and are considered housing burdened. In 2009, the highest value was 55% (Marin Co, CA) and the lowest value was 34% (Hamilton Co, IN).



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community


Indicator: Housing burden (Renters)



In 2009, the median value was 47%. In Montgomery County, 44% of renters pay greater than 30% of their income for housing and are considered housing burdened. In 2009, the highest value was 51% (Prince William Co, VA) and the lowest value was 36% (Arlington Co, VA).




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, GCT2515: Percent of Renter-Occupied Units Spending 30 Percent or More of Household Income on Rent and Utilities

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Median value of owner occupied housing units**

In 2009, the median value was \$402,350. The median value of owner occupied housing units in Montgomery County was \$459,900. In 2009, the highest value was \$820,200 (Marin Co, CA) and the lowest value was \$180,500 (Fort Bend Co, TX).




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; GCT2510: Median Housing Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (Dollars)

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Median value of owner occupied housing units**

In 2009, the median value was \$443,150. The median value of owner occupied housing units in Montgomery County was \$459,900. In 2009, the highest value was \$559,000 (Arlington Co, VA) and the lowest value was \$269,100 (Baltimore Co, MD).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; GCT2510: Median Housing Value of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (Dollars)




Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Median gross rent**

In 2009, the median gross rent was \$1,250. The median gross rent in Montgomery Co. was \$1,429. In 2009, the highest value was \$1,591 (Marin Co, CA and Arlington Co, VA) and the lowest value was \$832 (Waukesha Co, WI).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, GCT2514: Median Monthly Housing Costs for Renter-Occupied Housing Units (Dollars)



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Median gross rent**

In 2009, the median gross rent was \$1,322. The median gross rent in Montgomery Co. was \$1,429. In 2009, the highest value was \$1,591 (Arlington Co, VA) and the lowest value was \$1,059 (District of Columbia).




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, GCT2514: Median Monthly Housing Costs for Renter-Occupied Housing Units (Dollars)

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community

Indicator: Average number of days on market for home sale

Montgomery County, Average Days on Market



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Year End Real Estate Trend
Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community**Indicator: Average number of days on market for home sale**

Jurisdictions	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Q1-Q3)
Montgomery County, MD	59	87	106	95	67
Anne Arundel County, MD	70	109	138	134	118
Arlington County, VA	58	69	74	69	56
Fairfax County, VA	67	92	103	77	48
Howard County, MD	57	90	115	105	79
Loudoun County, VA	87	113	108	75	54
Prince George's County, MD	44	86	133	139	93
Prince William County, VA	78	124	120	70	41




Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Real Estate Trend
 Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format

Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community

Indicator: Number of Home Sales per 100,000 population

Montgomery County, Number of Home Sales per 100,000 population



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Real Estate Trend
Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format



Affordable Housing in an Inclusive Community


Indicator: Number of Home Sales per 100,000 population

Jurisdictions	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Q1-Q3)	2010 % of '09
Montgomery County, MD	1,364	1,044	853	1,025	791	77%
Anne Arundel County, MD	1,450	1,206	870	934	699	75%
Arlington County, VA	1,360	1,307	1,034	1,158	916	79%
Fairfax County, VA	1,495	1,258	1,294	1,006	338	34%
Howard County, MD	1,411	1,215	921	1,005	768	76%
Loudoun County, VA	1,808	1,604	1,690	1,677	1,186	71%
Prince George's County, MD	1,538	883	566	781	736	94%
Prince William County, VA	1,801	1,273	2,302	2,156	1,319	61%



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Real Estate Trend
Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format

Median Home Sale Price



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Year End Real Estate Trend Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format



Median Home Sale Price

Jurisdictions	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (Q1-Q3)
Montgomery County, MD	\$437,779	\$439,750	\$392,396	\$341,791	\$355,439
Anne Arundel County, MD	\$342,340	\$342,109	\$322,971	\$296,500	\$298,911
Arlington County, VA	\$492,367	\$482,983	\$448,979	\$453,465	\$455,411
Fairfax County, VA	\$468,146	\$469,658	\$372,663	\$341,454	\$386,822
Howard County, MD	\$383,815	\$388,283	\$369,033	\$345,013	\$364,061
Loudoun County, VA	\$465,421	\$427,313	\$341,098	\$327,954	\$362,167
Prince George's County, MD	\$327,738	\$318,425	\$275,762	\$218,935	\$189,244
Prince William County, VA	\$383,591	\$359,446	\$231,979	\$204,223	\$241,920



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Year End Real Estate Trend Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format

Affordable Housing Picture over Last Three Years

- Despite the economic downturn and high rate of foreclosures, Montgomery County has not lost ground due to active affordable housing efforts and programs.
- The County and non-profits, with county assistance, have stepped in the void created by private sector inactivity caused by economy.
- The County has aggressively attacked foreclosures by:
 - Counseling over 3000 families helping them reach positive outcomes in 2/3 of the cases,
 - Acquiring and rehabilitating over 40 foreclosed and vacant homes
 - Helping to stabilize neighborhoods by focusing foreclosure activity in two high impact areas of county.
- The County's affordable housing efforts have produced and/or preserved over 5,300 housing units for low and moderate income families over past three years.
- Aggressively and successfully seeking voluntary rental agreements from purchasers of multi-family rental developments which ensure some continued affordable rentals in those developments.



Source: DHCA

Special Topic: Foreclosures

Foreclosure Events

Total events, Notices of Default, Notices of Sale, Lender Purchases

- From the peak of foreclosures in 2009 Q3, Montgomery County has experienced a 36% decrease in total foreclosure events
- Notices of defaults declined by 46% over the same time period (2009Q3-2010Q3)
- When normalized by housing units, Montgomery County is 4th of the 5 largest jurisdictions, down from 2nd in 2009Q2, behind Prince George's County, Baltimore City, and Anne Arundel County.

Housing Units per Foreclosure Event, 3rd Quarter, 2010

Jurisdictions	Housing Units (As of Q409)		Foreclosures (As of Q310)	
	Number	% of total housing units in Maryland	Number	Housing units per Foreclosure
Prince George's	319,922	13.8%	4,116	78
Baltimore City	294,724	12.7%	1,873	157
Anne Arundel	202,705	8.7%	1,027	197
Montgomery	361,788	15.6%	1,428	253
Baltimore	327,577	14.1%	1,567	209


Note: In Q2 2010, Montgomery County had 229 housing units per foreclosure.

Compared to the same quarter last year (2009Q3-2010Q3), only Prince George's and Montgomery Counties had total foreclosure events decreases



Foreclosures: Total Events

Total Foreclosure Events, Montgomery County



Jurisdictions	2008-Q2	2008-Q3	2008-Q4	2009-Q1	2009-Q2	2009-Q3	2009-Q4	2010-Q1	2010-Q2	2010-Q3
Prince George's	2,853	2,789	3,621	3,071	3,427	4,454	5,116	3,816	4,331	4,115
Baltimore City	991	878	1,111	715	760	1,656	2,204	2,456	2,066	1,873
Montgomery	1,314	1,124	1,517	1,794	1,639	2,218	2,034	1,542	1,583	1,428
Baltimore	781	761	880	574	575	1,345	1,827	1,827	1,854	1,567
Anne Arundel	795	521	642	582	534	1,001	1,155	1,131	1,168	1,026

From the peak of foreclosures in 2009 Q3, Montgomery County has experienced a 36% decrease in total foreclosure events.

Colors represent year over year comparison


More than 25% increase
Between 25% and -25%
More than -25% decrease



Source: Maryland DHCD, Quarterly Foreclosure Reports

Foreclosures: Notices of Default

Notices of Default, Montgomery County



Jurisdictions	2008-Q2	2008-Q3	2008-Q4	2009-Q1	2009-Q2	2009-Q3	2009-Q4	2010-Q1	2010-Q2	2010-Q3
Prince George's	2,411	1,861	2,458	2,020	2,365	2,165	1,631	1,283	1,642	1,215
Baltimore City	832	596	928	568	617	565	569	824	655	345
Montgomery	1,162	584	861	1,076	811	864	869	594	537	465
Baltimore	679	513	712	415	426	641	589	651	622	322
Anne Arundel	648	333	455	437	400	354	498	429	405	243

In Montgomery County, notices of defaults declined by 46% compared to one year ago (2009 Q3).

Colors represent year over year comparison


	More than 25% increase
	Between 25% and -25%
	More than -25% decrease



Source: Maryland DHCD, Quarterly Foreclosure Reports

Foreclosures: Notices of Sale

Notices of Sale, Montgomery County



Jurisdictions	2008-Q2	2008-Q3	2008-Q4	2009-Q1	2009-Q2	2009-Q3	2009-Q4	2010-Q1	2010-Q2	2010-Q3
Prince George's	292	213	570	733	481	1,771	2,767	1,945	2,093	2,118
Baltimore City	112	40	38	37	22	831	1,320	1,050	1,127	1,138
Montgomery	76	137	332	524	519	986	809	592	452	651
Baltimore	73	40	29	29	10	520	994	937	960	964
Anne Arundel	35	50	81	64	16	474	479	566	552	627

Notices of sale increased in each jurisdiction compared to 2010Q2. However, in Montgomery County, notices of sale have decreased by 34% compared to 2009 Q3.

Colors represent year over year comparison


More than 25% increase
Between 25% and -25%
More than -25% decrease



Source: Maryland DHCD, Quarterly Foreclosure Reports

Foreclosures : Lender Purchases

Lender Purchases, Montgomery County



Jurisdictions	2008-Q2	2008-Q3	2008-Q4	2009-Q1	2009-Q2	2009-Q3	2009-Q4	2010-Q1	2010-Q2	2010-Q3
Prince George's	150	715	592	318	581	519	718	588	596	783
Baltimore City	47	242	145	110	120	260	315	582	285	390
Montgomery	76	403	324	193	309	368	356	356	594	312
Baltimore	29	208	139	130	139	184	244	239	272	281
Anne Arundel	112	138	106	81	119	173	178	136	211	157

In Montgomery County, lender purchases have declined compared to last quarter (2010 Q2) and last year (2009 Q3).

Colors represent year over year comparison

More than 25% increase
Between 25% and -25%
More than -25% decrease



Source: Maryland DHCD, Quarterly Foreclosure Reports

Foreclosures: Hot Spot Analysis

Hot Spots: Montgomery County communities over time

- Maryland Dept of Housing and Community Development has identified 5 “hot spots” in Montgomery County in 2010Q3, down from 10 in 2009Q4 (the last time we met), and down from the high of 19 in 2009/Q1
- CountyStat, in a separate analysis, identified 7 communities in the 7-10-2009 meeting which represent most of the foreclosure activity in the County
 - Germantown (20874), Gaithersburg (20877 & 20879), Montgomery Village (20886), Wheaton (20902), Colesville (20904), Aspen Hill (20906)

Foreclosures (Q3/2010)

- Q3 & Q4 2009 seems to be the peak of foreclosure activity in these communities
- Of the communities id’d here, only Montgomery Village is still considered a “hot spot” by the State
- Foreclosures in Gaithersburg (20877 & 20879) and Colesville have returned to pre-2008 levels
- After 2 quarters of improvements, Aspen Hill had a greater than 10% increase in foreclosures compared to the previous quarter (Q2/2010).
- Compared to the same period last year (Q3/2009), 5 of the 7 communities (*) had decrease of more than 10% in the number of foreclosure events.

Total Foreclosure Events

Community	2007	2008	2009	2010*
Germantown*	347	676	910	535
Gaithersburg* (20877)	153	381	480	247
Gaithersburg* (20879)	150	302	441	209
Montgomery Village	233	482	630	383
Wheaton*	165	320	449	258
Colesville*	167	294	289	232
Aspen Hill	253	534	737	412

**2010 is presently incomplete (Q1, Q2 and Q3 only)*



Foreclosures Hot Spot Analysis: Communities w/ High Foreclosure Concentration

Zip Codes		2007				2008				2009				2010		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
20874	Germantown	23	60	106	158	204	157	145	170	229	173	267	241	172	196	167
20877	Gaithersburg	9	37	42	65	103	87	86	105	118	107	143	112	88	91	68
20879	Gaithersburg	6	21	49	74	85	72	59	86	114	99	110	118	78	76	55
20886	Montgomery Village	18	50	67	98	143	115	93	131	148	130	186	166	123	143	117
20902	Wheaton (Silver Spring)	9	42	42	72	89	75	62	94	105	97	130	117	80	87	91
20904	Colesville (Silver Spring)	11	29	48	79	95	71	53	75	80	86	123	112	82	82	68
20906	Aspen Hill (Silver Spring)	14	55	69	115	162	126	108	138	179	141	202	215	142	119	151

Seven zip codes represent half of all foreclosure activity in the County.

Key

	More than 10% increase
	Between 10% and -10%
	More than -10% decrease



Source: Maryland DHCD; Quarterly Foreclosure Reports; Data sent by Co. DHCA

Foreclosures Hot Spot Analysis:

Hot Spots: Montgomery County communities over time

Housing Indicators


- Units sold in those zip codes represent 30-40% of total units sold in the county
- Median Home Sale Price has been and continues to be lower than the median home sale price for the entire county
- For the last three quarters (2009Q4-2010Q2), Average Number of Days on Market is lower for this subset compared to the entire county. This has fluctuated over the observed period.

Housing units sold in identified hot spot zip codes as a % of total units sold in Montgomery County, 2007-2009

	2007				2008				2009				2010	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
Units sold in Hot Spots	814	964	776	581	468	712	797	696	567	915	1,029	974	713	1,032
% of total units sold in the county	32%	32%	30%	32%	32%	30%	33%	38%	38%	34%	35%	37%	38%	33%




Foreclosures Hot Spot Analysis: Median Home Sales Price in Communities with High Foreclosure Concentration



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Year End Real Estate Trend Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format



Foreclosures Hot Spot Analysis: Average Days on Market in Communities with High Foreclosure Concentration



Source: Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc., Year End Real Estate Trend Indicator - Less than \$30K to greater than \$500K Format



Foreclosures : Outreach Efforts

County Foreclosure Programs

- **Education & Outreach: foreclosure workshops**
 - 145 workshops have been held; many have been in areas of high foreclosures
 - More than half of the workshops held have had less than 50 participants
 - However, DHCA has encouraged workshop organizers to adopt a more individualized approach, resulting in lower attendance
- **Counseling: individual foreclosure counseling**
 - More than 4,000 clients have been served
 - According to foreclosure counselor agency reports, the most commonly reported outcome is “mortgage modified”



Foreclosures: Outreach & Education Workshops

- DHCA, with partner agencies, has held 145 outreach and education workshops since April 2008
- 70% of workshops held were in foreclosure hot spot zipcodes (Germantown, Gaithersburg, Silver Spring)
- Most workshops had fewer than 50 participants, in line with DHCA's more individualized approach

Year	2008	2009	2010
# of Workshops	21	46	78

Attendance	Workshops
0-24	95
25-49	25
50-69	10
70-99	7
100+	8
Total Workshops	145



Source: DHCA

Foreclosures: Prevention Counseling

Counseling Centers	Reporting Period	Number of Clients Counseled As of 12-09
Homefree-USA	9/08-9/10	2,992
Latino Economic Development Corporation	9/08-9/10	566
Housing Initiative Partnership	1/09-9/10	563

- The County contracts with three housing counseling agencies to perform foreclosure counseling for County residents
- Through September 2010, these agencies counseled 4,121 clients



Source: Counseling vendor monthly reports, DHCA

Wrap-up

- Follow-up items

